arXiv:1604.02864v1 [quant-ph] 11 Apr 2016

Stokes vector and its relationship to Discrete Wigner Functions of multiphoton states

K.Srinivasan and G.Raghavan*
Theoretical studies section, Material Science Group,
Indira Gandhi centre for atomic research, Kalpakkam, Tamilnadu, 603102, India.
(Dated: November 6, 2016)

Stokes vectors and Discrete Wigner functions (DWF) provide two alternate ways of representing the polarization state of multiphoton systems. The Stokes vector associated with a n-photon polarization state is unique, and its Minkowski squared norm provides a direct way of quantifying entanglement through n-concurrence. However, the quantification of entanglement from DWF is not straight forward. The DWF associated with a given quantum state is not unique but depends on the way in which basis vectors are assigned to various lines in the phase space. For a Hilbert space of dimension N, there exists N^{N+1} such possible assignments. While a given DWF corresponds to a unique Stokes vector, the converse is not true. In the present work, we show that, for each particular assignment called a quantum net, there exist a unique Hadamard matrix which relates the Stokes vector to the corresponding DWF. This method provides an elegant and direct method of constructing the DWFs from the Stokes vector for every possible choice of the quantum net. Using these results, we derive the relationship between the Stokes vector of a spin-flipped state and the DWF. Finally, we also present a method to express the Minkowskian squared norm of the Stokes vector directly in terms of the DWF.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.67.Mn, 42.79.Ta.

I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum optics, the quantum state of multiqubit systems can be variedly represented through the density matrix, Stokes vector and Discrete Wigner functions (DWFs). Of these, the density matrix is by far the most widely used and techniques for entanglement detection and quantification are defined in terms of this representation [1–6]. However, Stokes vectors and the DWFs are equally valid representations of the state and are both amenable to direct measurements [7–10]. Stokes vectors have the advantage that a entanglement measure for multiqubit state called the generalized concurrence can be defined[11, 12]. This measure is basically related to the Minkowski squared norm of the Stokes vector. Wigner functions are phase space representations of the state which find extensive applications in quantum optics. Discrete Wigner functions are real valued and normalized functions defined over a lattice and find applications in quantum computation, teleportation and the tomographic reconstruction of qubit systems. In the present work, we are interested in deriving a direct relationship between a general n-qubit Stokes vector and the DWF, circumventing the need to compute the density matrix as an intermediate step. In doing so, we confront the fact that the representation of the state through the DWF is not unique, but the Stokes vector is. The polarization state of a photon is represented by the Stokes vector with four parameters, related to the total intensity and difference in the intensities associated with measurements using three complementary basis sets. In quantum mechanical terms, they are related to the expectation values of Pauli operators with respect to the state ρ. DWFs which are discrete analogues of continuous Wigner functions,[13, 14] and have several alternate formulations [15–18]. The present work is based on the construction by Wootters[19–21] and Gibbons et al[22]. In Wootters' construction, the DWF of a d-dimensional system is set of real numbers (not necessarily positive) defined over a $d\times d$ lattice. As will be described later, the numbers associated with each of the points is obtained from outcome probabilities of projective measurements using different basis sets. Since the definition of both Stokes vectors and DWF involve probabilities of measurement outcomes, the relationship between the two quantities need careful investigation. Conventionally, the computation of the Stokes vector of the given DWF involves some arduous calculations. To appreciate this fact, let us consider the definitions of the DWF and Stokes vectors in terms of the density matrix : The density matrix may be defined by $\rho = \sum W_\alpha A_\alpha$, where W_α are the DWF elements and A_α are self-adjoint operators associated with each point of a discrete lattice. For polarization states of a n-photon system, there are N^2 phase space points, where $N = 2^n$, and so the reconstruction of ρ involves the addition of N^2 matrices weighted by the DWF element associated with each point. Once the density matrix is constructed, the corresponding Stokes vector is calculated using the expression $S_{i_1..i_n} = \frac{1}{2^n} Tr(\rho\sigma_{i_1}\otimes\sigma_{i_2}\otimes...\otimes\sigma_{i_n})$. Since the density matrix, DWF and the Stokes vector are all related through linear transformations, such a circuitous procedure can be avoided if a prescription is provided for computing the Stokes vector parameters from the DWFs and vice versa. In this article we develop such a procedure which also addresses the issues related to the choice of quantum net alluded to earlier. Earlier work of M.Holmes and P.K.Aravind shows that, for a given DWF there exists a Hadamard matrix which transforms it to the corresponding Stokes vector, but the form of the Hadamard trans-

* gr@igcar.gov.in

formation for different quantum nets is not provided[23]. To the best of our knowledge, the general prescription for obtaining this invertible transformation for a n-qubit system and its dependence on the quantum net are absent in the literature. For a discrete phase space of dimension N, there exists N^{N+1} possible quantum nets. For each quantum net, there is a unique Hadamard matrix that transforms the DWF to the Stokes vector. Since these Hadamard matrices are invertible, we show that the DWF can be computed from the Stokes vector as well. Finally, we discuss some interesting features associated with the spin flip operation. Bipartite Concurrence and its multipartite generalizations are important entanglement measures[3, 11, 12]. For n-qubit systems, we define a family of Hadamard matrices S_H^n, such that for each Hadamard matrix H, there exists a unique Hadamard matrix $\tilde{H}$ that takes any given DWF to the Stokes vector corresponding to the spin flipped state $\tilde{\rho}$. Our article is arranged as follows: In section II we provide a brief introduction to the DWF construction of Wootters and Gibbons et al. In section III-A, for transparency, we illustrate our method for a single qubit system and generalize the same for a multiqubit system in III-B. In III-C, we discuss the procedure for obtaining the Stokes vector for the spin-flipped state. Derivation of Minkowski squared norm in terms of the DWF is presented in Section IV. We conclude the paper in Section V with some brief remarks.

II. DISCRETE WIGNER FUNCTION

There are many constructions available to generalize Wigner functions to discrete dimensional quantum systems. Here we briefly discuss the one introduced by Wootters. For quantum systems defined in a Hilbert space of dimension N, the discrete "phase space" is a $N \times N$ array of points. Like the continuous case, the horizontal and vertical axes are associated with two non-commuting observables. For example, in the discrete array associated with single photon polarization states, the horizontal and the vertical axes are associated with Pauli's Z and X operators. The points in the phase space are labelled by the elements of the finite field $\mathcal{F}_N$. Since this finite field exists only for prime or the power of prime dimensions, the DWF is defined only for such cases. For composite systems, we can define a basis for the field elements, and express all the elements of the field as: $q = \sum_i q_i e_i$, where $q \in \mathcal{F}_N$, $q_i \in \mathcal{F}_r$ and e_i is the element of the basis, $B = \{e_1, e_2, ..., e_n\}$. Once the basis for the horizontal axis is fixed, then the basis for the vertical axis can be uniquely defined. It is easy to see that the discrete phase space has the structure of an Euclidean space. In this space, we may define a line as a set of N points subject to the the the equation $aq+bp = c$. Parallel lines are lines that have the same a and b but different c. Since parallel lines never intersect, they do not have a common point and non-parallel lines share a single point. There are $N(N+1)$ lines in discrete phase space which can be grouped into set of $N+1$ parallel lines. The set of parallel lines are called striations, and each striation is associated with an observable. The lines in the striations are associated with the eigenvectors of this observable. We define translational operators in phase space $\hat{T}_{(\alpha,\beta)}$, whose action on a line results in translating every point in that line by amount (α, β). In all, there are N^2 such translational operators and for a given striation there are $N-1$ translational operators which leave the lines in the striation invariant. The common eigenvectors of these $N-1$ translational operators forms a basis which can be associated with the lines in that striation. In total, $N+1$ orthonormal basis sets are available which are mutually unbiased. Mutually unbiased basis sets (MUBs) being defined thus:

Orthonormal basis sets $B_1 = \{|v_1\rangle, |v_2\rangle, ..., |v_n\rangle\}$ and $B_2 = \{|u_1\rangle, |u_2\rangle, ..., |u_n\rangle\}$ are mutually unbiased if

$$|\langle v_j|u_{j'}\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{N}$$

Each line is associated with a pure state represented by a rank one projector $Q(\lambda_i^j)$, where λ_i^j refers to jth line in the i^{th} striation. The sum of DWF elements along a given line λ_i^j is equal to the expectation value of the projector $Q(\lambda_i^j) = \left|\lambda_i^j\right\rangle \left\langle\lambda_i^j\right|$:

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\lambda} W_\alpha = Tr(\rho Q(\lambda))$$

The discrete Wigner element at the point α is then

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{N}\left[\sum_{\lambda\ni\alpha} Tr(\rho Q(\lambda)) - 1\right]$$

This equation can be simplified as

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{N}(\rho A_\alpha) \tag{1}$$

where the A_α are the phase space point operators

$$A_\alpha = \sum_{\lambda\ni\alpha} Q(\lambda) - I \tag{2}$$

These operators A_α are self-adjoint and have unit trace with $Tr(A_\alpha A_\beta) = N\delta_{\alpha\beta}$.

III. DERIVATION OF RESULTS

A. One qubit system

Any one qubit system can be represented using the 2×2 identity matrix and the Pauli matrix as the basis

$$\rho = [s_0 I + \vec{s}.\vec{\sigma}]$$

Table I. DWFs W^I, W^X, W^Y and W^Z of the 2×2 identity matrix and Pauli matrices σ_X, σ_Y, σ_Z respectively.

A	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
D	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
I	H	V

A	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
D	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
X	H	V

A	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
D	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
Y	H	V

A	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
D	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
Z	H	V

which may be written as

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{3} s_i \sigma_i \tag{3}$$

Each element of the Stokes vector is given by $s_i = \frac{1}{2}Tr(\sigma_i \rho)$, where σ_i's are the Pauli matrices, $i \in [0, x, y, z]$ The column vector with coefficients s_i as entries is known as the Stokes vector, i.e., $\vec{S} = (s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3)^T$.

Using the phase space point operators as the basis and DWFs as the weighting factor one can also express the density matrix as

$$\rho = \sum_{\alpha} W_\alpha A_\alpha \tag{4}$$

Thus, the Stokes vector and the DWF are characterized by four real parameters. From Eq (3) and Eq (4),the difference between these two representations is the following: Each element in the Stokes vector is reconstructed by the difference in the intensities or the probabilities in three mutually unbiased basis sets. In the case of the DWF, projective measurements yield only the sum of the DWF elements associated with a line and not the individual entries. Hence, to obtain the value of a single element, three projective measurements would be required.

For a one qubit system, the horizontal and vertical axis are associated with Pauli's σ_Z and σ_X operators respectively. The finite field elements $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ are used to label the points in this discrete 2×2 "phase space". Lines in the horizontal axis are associated with the eigenvectors of the σ_Z operators denoted by $|H\rangle$ and $|V\rangle$. Lines in the vertical axis are associated with the eigenvectors of the σ_X operators denoted by $|D\rangle$ and $|A\rangle$. Finally the diagonal lines are associated with the eigenvectors of the σ_y operators $|R\rangle$ and $|L\rangle$. The assignment of these eigenstates to the lines in the phase space is not unique. Each possible assignment is known as a quantum net. To facilitate further analysis we now represent the set of Wigner elements $\{W_{00}, W_{01}, W_{10}, W_{11}\}$ by a column vector $W = (W_{00}, W_{01}, W_{10}, W_{11})^T$. Denoting the DWF of the Pauli matrices σ_0, σ_x, σ_y and σ_z by W^I, W^X, W^Y and W^Z respectively the DWFs of the Pauli's operators take the form shown in Table I.

From Table I, it is clear that each element of the DWF of the Pauli matrices is $\frac{1}{2}$ multiplied by some phase factor. If U and V are the DWF of the two operators ρ_U and ρ_V, then

$$Tr(\rho_U \rho_V) = 2\sum_{\alpha} U_\alpha V_\alpha \tag{5}$$

Therefore, the Stokes vector S can be represented using this fact by,

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \sum_{\alpha} W^I_\alpha W_\alpha \\ S_x &= \sum_{\alpha} W^X_\alpha W_\alpha \\ S_y &= \sum_{\alpha} W^Y_\alpha W_\alpha \\ S_z &= \sum_{\alpha} W^Z_\alpha W_\alpha \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Using the Eq (6)and the DWF of the Pauli operators from the Table I, the Stokes vector can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha} W_\alpha \\ S_x &= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\text{ij}} (-1)^j W_{ij} \\ S_y &= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\text{ij}} (-1)^i W_{ij} \\ S_z &= \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\text{ij}} (-1)^{i\oplus j} W_{ij} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\oplus$ is addition modulo two. If the DWF is represented as a column vector, then Eq (7) can be simplified as

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ S_x \\ S_y \\ S_z \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} W_{00} \\ W_{01} \\ W_{10} \\ W_{11} \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

$$S = HW \tag{9}$$

where H is a constant times a Hadamard matrix. This Hadamard matrix depends on the choice of the quantum net used to represent the Pauli operators as given in table-I. For the one qubit system, there are 8 possible quantum nets. So that, for each quantum net, there is one Hadamard matrix that takes the DWF to the corresponding Stokes vector. The equation given above can be rewritten as

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ S_x \\ S_y \\ S_z \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} W_{00}+W_{01}+W_{10}+W_{11} \\ W_{00}-W_{01}+W_{10}-W_{11} \\ W_{00}-W_{01}-W_{10}+W_{11} \\ W_{00}+W_{01}-W_{10}-W_{11} \end{pmatrix} \tag{10}$$

Since the sum of the Wigner elements along a line is associated with the probabilities Eq (10) can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ S_x \\ S_y \\ S_z \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ P(+)-P(-) \\ P(R)-P(L) \\ P(H)-P(V) \end{pmatrix} \tag{11}$$

This is a well known equation for reconstructing the general polarization state of the photon using over-complete measurements. The phase factors in Eq (7) may change for different quantum nets, however they result in the same probabilities. This transformation given in Eq (8) is invertible and therefore the DWF is readily constructed from the Stokes vector as

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_{00} \\ W_{01} \\ W_{10} \\ W_{11} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_0 \\ S_x \\ S_y \\ S_z \end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

$$W = H^{-1}S \tag{13}$$

This step is crucial, because when we find the DWF associated with the given Stokes vector, we should specify what quantum net we are using for the reconstruction of the DWF. This information about the quantum net gets embedded in the form of the resulting Hadamard matrix used for the transformation. In the next section we generalize this method to n-qubit systems. For the n - qubit system there are N^{N+1} quantum nets with one Hadamard matrix for each quantum net.

B. N-qubit system

General n-photon polarization states may be described using the generalized Pauli matrices as basis,

$$\rho = \sum_{i_1 \ldots i_n = 0}^{3} S_{i_1 \ldots i_n} \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \sigma_{i_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{i_n} \tag{14}$$

and the n-photon Stokes parameters can be calculated as

$$S_{i_1 \ldots i_n} = \frac{1}{2^n} Tr(\rho \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \sigma_{i_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{i_n}) \tag{15}$$

Let W be the DWF of ρ and $U^{i_1 \ldots i_n}$ be the DWF of the operator $\sigma_{i_1} \otimes \sigma_{i_2} \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_{i_n}$. Then the Stokes parameters are directly computed from the DWFs of the n-photon polarization state and the generalized Pauli matrices by

$$S_{i_1 \ldots i_n} = \sum_{\alpha} W_\alpha U_\alpha^{i_1 \ldots i_n} \tag{16}$$

The DWF elements of the generalized Pauli matrices are $\pm \frac{1}{2^n}$. Therefore from Eq (16), the generalized Stokes parameters can be written using the DWF as

$$S_{i_1 \ldots i_n} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\alpha} (-1)^{f(\alpha)} W_\alpha \tag{17}$$

If the elements of the DWF of the n-photon polarization state are arranged as a column vector, then the corresponding Stokes vector can be calculated using the Hadamard matrices by

$$S = HW \tag{18}$$

Here, the $N^2 \times N^2$ dimensional Hadamard matrix is weighted by the factor $\frac{1}{N}$, where $N = 2^n$. As in the single qubit case, the inverse of this Hadamard matrix transforms the Stokes parameter to the corresponding DWF. For the n-qubit system, we now define the set of all Hadamard matrices S_H^n containing N^{N+1} elements as

$$S_H^n = \left\{ H(1),\, H(2), \ldots, H(N^{N+1}) \right\} \tag{19}$$

where $H(k)$ refers to the Hadamard matrix associated with the k^{th} quantum net.

C. Spin flip operation for n-qubit systems

Spin flip is an important symmetry operation in the fields quantum information and quantum computation. On a single qubit represented as a point on the Poincaré sphere, spin flip takes the point to one anti-podal to it. Since this operation is an involution symmetry operation involving complex conjugation, it cannot be realized experimentally. Nevertheless it is an essential tool for entanglement detection and its quantification. For multiphoton polarization states, the spin flip operation is defined as $\tilde{\rho} = \sigma_y^{\otimes n} \rho^* \sigma_y^{\otimes n}$, where the $*$ operation stands for complex conjugation in the computation basis and σ_y the Pauli matrix. We may note here that spin flip is an antiunitary operation[24]. In a recent work we proved that the spin flip operation can be performed on a DWF of the multiqubit systems through a Hadamard transformation which is independent of the quantum net[25]. If W and $\tilde{W}$ are the DWF (arranged as a column vector) of the state and the spin flipped state respectively, of the n-qubit system, then $\tilde{W}$ can be calculated from W by

$$\tilde{W} = TW \tag{20}$$

where T is the Hadamard matrix that is different from one that used to transform DWF to the Stokes vector. Therefore T does not belong to the set S_H^n. From Eq (18) we can write the Stokes vector of the spin flipped state as

$$\tilde{S} = H\tilde{W} \tag{21}$$

Using Eq (20), one can directly calculate $\tilde{S}$ from the given DWF W by

$$\tilde{S} = HTW$$

It is important to note here that, $H \in S_H^n$, but, $T \notin S_H^n$. However, the product HT is always the element from the set S_H^n. We denote this new element by $\tilde{H} = HT$. Interestingly we find, that for a given H(k), $\tilde{H}$(k) is obtained by flipping each state associated with the quantum net Q_i. Therefore in the set S_H for every H, there exists one unique $\tilde{H}$ which transforms a DWF to its spin flipped Stokes vector.

IV. MINKOWSKY SQUARED NORM OF AN N-QUBIT STATE IN TERMS OF THE DWF

For a n - photon polarization states the multiphoton Stokes parameters can be defined as follows

$$S_{i_1 i_2 ... i_n} = \frac{1}{2^n} Tr(\rho \sigma_{i_1} \otimes \sigma_{i_2} \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_{i_n}) \tag{22}$$

where ρ is the multiqubit density matrix and σ_i's are the Pauli matrices. For this Stokes parameter $S_{i_1 i_2 ... i_n}$ we can define a Stokes scalar

$$\begin{aligned} S^2_{(n)} =& \frac{1}{2^n}[(S_{0...0})^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n}\sum_{i_k=1}^{3} (S_{0...i_k...0})^2 \\ & - \sum_{k,l=1}^{n}\sum_{i_k,i_l=1}^{3} (S_{0..i_k...i_l...0})^2 \\ & - ... + (-1)^n \sum_{i_1,i_2,....,i_n=1}^{3} (S_{i_1....,i_n})^2] \end{aligned}$$

For a n - photon polarization states this Stokes scalar is invariant under SLOCC and it is a $O_0(1,3)$ group invariant length[11]. This Stokes scalar is also called the Minkowskian squared norm. This Minkowskian squared norm of the Stokes tensor is related to the corresponding density matrix ρ and its spin flipped density matrix $\tilde{\rho}$ by

$$S^2_{(n)} = Tr(\rho\tilde{\rho}) = Tr(R)$$

where $R = \rho\tilde{\rho}$ is used quantify the entanglement of the n - qubit systems $S^2_{(n)}$. For two qubit systems, concurrence can be calculated from the eigenvalues of R matrix. Therefore the quantity $S^2_{(n)} = Tr(\rho\tilde{\rho})$ is very useful in calculating the n-concurrence of the multiqubit system. Here, we show that we can calculate the n-concurrence of the system, $C^2(|\psi>) = S^2_{(n)}$ directly for a given discrete Wigner function. To compute the n-concurrence we use the fact, if ρ and σ are two different states and W and V are the corresponding DWFs, then, $Tr(\rho\sigma) = N\sum_{\alpha} W_\alpha V_\alpha$. So in this case, the pure state concurrence can be written as $C(|\psi>) = \sqrt{Tr(\rho\tilde{\rho})} = \sqrt{N\sum_{\alpha} W_\alpha \tilde{W}_\alpha}$. Using the column vector notation for the DWF, concurrence can be calculated as

$$C(|\psi>) = \sqrt{NW^T\tilde{W}} = \sqrt{NW^THW} \tag{23}$$

If W is the DWF of the pure two qubit system, then concurrence can be calculated directly from the given two qubit DWF by the relation, $C(|\psi>) = 2\sqrt{W^THW}$.

The relation between the multipartite entanglement measure $S^2_{(n)}$, mixedness of the state $M(\rho)$ and the measure of spin flip symmetry of the state is given by

$$S^2_{(n)} + M(\rho) = I(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) \tag{24}$$

where $M(\rho) = 1 - Tr(\rho^2) = 1 - \sum_{\alpha} W^2_\alpha$ and $I(\rho,\tilde{\rho}) = 1 - D^2_{HS}(\rho - \tilde{\rho})$ can also be defined as the measure of the indistinguishability of the state from its spin flipped state, where $D^2_{HS}(\rho - \tilde{\rho}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}Tr\left[(\rho - \tilde{\rho})^2\right]}$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt distance between state and its spin flipped counterpart[12]. For a pure multiqubit states, $M(\rho) = 0$, from Eq (23) and Eq (24) it is clear that

$$S^2_{(n)} = I(\rho, \tilde{\rho}) = NW^THW \tag{25}$$

Therefore for a pure multiqubit systems the entanglement measure $S^2_{(n)}$ and $I(\rho,\tilde{\rho})$ are equal and this can be calculated directly from the multiqubit DWF using Eq (25).

V. CONCLUSIONS

Each of the different representation of the quantum state of multiphoton systems brings with it certain advantages. Though these representations are related through linear transformations, the physical insights and computational advantages provided by one is not readily translated in terms of the other. For continuous quantum systems, the representation of the state by Wigner functions provides a clear-cut distinction between classical and quantum states of light. The Wigner function for the former are positive but the latter can be negative. Phase-space representation of the such states provide deep insights into quantum interference effects. In the case of discrete multiqubit systems, the relationship between different representations is little explored. The representation of multiqubit system through density operators provides, atleast for pure states, the tools to distinguish between separable and entangled states. Entanglement measures are also defined in terms of the density operators. In optics, the Stokes vector, both the classical and quantum versions, provides a direct experimental means of measurement. The less prevalent DWF too has proved to be useful in the context of quantum computation, stabilizer codes for error correction and so forth. Whenever optical qubits are used in the case of quantum information or quantum computation, it is useful to understand the relationship between these representations. The present paper was an attempt at examining such an inter-relationship. He we have exhibited the existence of a simple relationship between the DWF and the Stokes vector. The two were shown to be related through a Hadamard matrix which can be computed for any choice of quantum net used for the construction of the DWF. Thus, the prescription for obtaining the complete set S_H of Hadamard matrices associated with every choice of the quantum net was provided.Thus, independent of the measurement context under which data was obtained, the present results enable us to easily switch between one representation and the other. It was further shown that the spin-flipped Stokes vector can be obtained

through a Hadamard matrix which itself member of the set S_H.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the authors(K. Srinivasan) acknowledges Indira Gandhi centre for atomic research, DAE for the award of research fellowship. Useful suggestions and discussions with Gururaj Kadiri and B.Radhakrishna is hereby acknowledged by the authors.

[1] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Physics Letters A **223**, 1 (1996).
[2] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).
[3] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[4] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
[5] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[6] B. M. Terhal, Physics Letters A **271**, 319 (2000).
[7] H. G. Berry, G. Gabrielse, and A. E. Livingston, Appl. Opt. **16**, 3200 (1977).
[8] E. Collett, Optics Communications **52**, 77 (1984).
[9] D. F. V. James, P. G. Kwiat, W. J. Munro, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052312 (2001).
[10] R. Asplund and G. Björk, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 012106 (2001).
[11] G. Jaeger, M. Teodorescu-Frumosu, A. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032307 (2003).
[12] G. Jaeger, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022318 (2003).
[13] E. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **40**, 749 (1932).
[14] M. Hillery, R. O'Connell, M. Scully, and E. Wigner, Physics Reports **106**, 121 (1984).
[15] D. Galetti and A. T. Piza, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **186**, 513 (199
[16] L. Cohen and M. Scully, Foundations of Physics **16**, 295 (1986).
[17] S. Chaturvedi, E. Ercolessi, G. Marmo, G. Morandi, N. Mukunda, and R. Simon, Pramana **65**, 981.
[18] D. Gross, Journal of Mathematical Physics **47**, 122107 (2006).
[19] W. K. Wootters, Annals of Physics **176**, 1 (1987).
[20] W. Wootters, Foundations of Physics **16**, 391 (1986).
[21] W. K. Wootters, IBM J. Res. Dev. **48**, 99 (2004).
[22] K. S. Gibbons, M. J. Hoffman, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062101 (2004).
[23] M. Holmes, W. Schudy, and P. K. Aravind, Thesis:Bachelor of science, Worcester Polytechnic Institute (2005).
[24] N. Gisin and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 432 (1999).
[25] K.Srinivasan and G.Raghavan, arXiv:1604.00188.